

BRITISH IMPERIALISM STILL A DOMINANT POWER

HERE is a tendency in Socialist circles to discount the power of the British empire. They talk about the "old lion" and stress the "age" of dependance on America. The trend of thought seems to be that "the old nineteenth century imperialist order in Britain was founded on imperialism: that order is decaying, and since we dislike it, we must think of it as decaying. As we socialists get stronger: colonising imperialism must give way to socialist policies." This is a high account of a way of looking at the modern British world which is very common in socialistic and Socialist circles and is not unknown in anarchist ones.

Now it may be true that imperialism is a waning force, for capitalist economics tends to destroy itself. But even if it is on the wane that does not mean that the process is staid, or has progressed very far. Indeed one may wonder whether the parliamentary socialism of to-day does not represent a more rapid decay of the more dynamic socialism of the nineteenth century than the same alleged process in the case of British imperialism! Certainly it is quite misleading to regard imperialism as a spent force which does not require serious combating. Nor should it be forgotten that it is not merely its economic power that constitutes its strength but also its ideas—what is called "the philosophy of empire". In this respect, imperialism has secured some signal victories, for it has succeeded to a remarkable extent in infecting socialism with its own ideas and outlook, for the Labour Party in power has conducted the empire with very much the same philosophy and outlook as the Tories.

The idea that the advent of American imperialism has sounded the death knell for its British parent is also founded largely on socialistic wishful thinking. Without minimizing the serious effect of American competition—not by the way any new thing, as the history of the invasion of European markets by American wheat in the eighteenth century recalls—it is a far cry to see in it the dissolution of British im-

perial power. The British Empire is founded on competition, on the capturing of markets, and is not likely to be worried overmuch by increased U.S. rivalry, nor to lack reserves and elasticity to meet it, yet such a nervelessness seems to be assumed by the "dying lion" school.

An example which ought to provoke thought is the Persian oil crisis. The Anglo-Iranian company, in which the British government have interests, lost at a stroke an enormous capital asset, an enormous annual income, and for two years experienced a complete drying up of its economic life. Yet when there is a possibility of resuming work at Abadan it transpires that the loss of Persian oil has been made good, and that there is likely to be as much difficulty in finding room once again for Persian oil as there was at its sudden loss.

It is not the first time British oil interests have shown themselves capable of tremendous elasticity and tremendous strength. Francis Delisle wrote (for the Labour Party) just after the first world war an account of British businessmen's reaction to the entry of oil into world economics, which was most revealing. In 1914 the British Empire was founded upon coaling stations throughout the sea highways of the globe. In 1918 half the world's ships were powered by oil, and the war had permitted the United States to secure a seemingly impregnable hold over world oil resources. Yet in a very few years British business had acquired a secure foothold in oil, and had an effective say in the councils of American oil companies.

Recently the Petroleum Information Bureau has issued a survey of the present position of the British oil industry which makes informative reading—especially to those

JUDGES ON STRIKE

Bolivian judges on a sit-down strike for higher salaries, are refusing to try any cases. The Government says it is illegal to increase Government employees pay.

—News Chronicle, 26/9/53.

DECLINE OF THE CHURCH

ON matters of the Church, the second highest authority in Britain is the Archbishop of York—Dr. Cyril Garbett. We therefore should not argue with him when he tells of the condition of the Church to-day, and indeed we are, in this respect, only too pleased to accept his words as gospel.

In a speech recently at Selby, Yorkshire, Dr. Garbett spoke of the "general retreat from Christianity" in England, as seen in the decline in church-going. As a result of this, bemoaned the Archbishop. "Neither national nor local opinion pays the same heed as once it did to the voice of the Church".

Pointing out that theft is no longer regarded as a serious crime provided it is not on too large a scale and is undetected, Dr. Garbett went on:

"Equally disturbing has been the departure from the Christian teaching on marriage as a life-long union between man and woman.

"One of the foundations of national character is the building of the Christian home on the permanency of marriage. But it is now attacked and undermined as it never has been since Europe was converted to Christianity.

"The Christian teaching on chastity has become for many a target of scorn. Some of our present-day novelists are almost fanatical in preaching a new gospel of sexual licence, and their autobiographies too often show that they practise what they preach.

"To-day sexual licence is widely assumed as necessary for self-realisation or as praiseworthy because it gives pleasure."

The Archbishop commented on the part industrialisation played in undermining religion but then went on to maintain that in some directions the moral standards of our time showed an advance on the past. There was a far stronger sense of the necessity of social justice, he said.

The Anarchist movement can congratulate itself on having played a part in both the destructive side of undermining the Church's grip on people's minds and the constructive side in helping to develop the concepts of social justice.

The social ethics of Anarchism are based upon humanism, and as such are far more deeply rooted than those of Christianity, based on authority, obscurantism and superstition.

who discount the economic power of the Empire. The following quotations are taken from the *Times'* summary of this survey:

"It used to be said that the wealth of Britain was founded on coal. It is probably still the case that coal is the greatest source of energy even if an increasing share now emerges as electrical power. But coal is being rivalled by oil. . . .

"Oil powers and lubricates Britain's 4,500,000 road vehicles, her aircraft, most of her merchant ships, her farm tractors, her industrial machinery, and plant. Oil provides her with hundreds of derivatives on which industries as diverse as synthetic soap powders, insecticides, plastics, and paint are based. To meet this tremendous demand, British oil companies, in association with Dutch interests, have extended their activities all over the globe, and now produce 100 millions tons of crude oil a year, or more than a third of all oil entering into world trade. They have wells in all the main oil-bearing regions outside the Soviet territories, notably in the Middle East and Venezuela, where they account for about one-third of all production, and in the Far East, where they account for about two-thirds. Their stake in the marketing of oil is even greater, for they handle up to 50 per cent. of the world's trade, and have even been forced to buy crude or refined oil from American companies to keep abreast of demand. Refining capacity is over 100 million tons of crude a year, with additional plant under construction. To move this torrent of crude and refined oil they rely on a tanker fleet which, with a carrying capacity of 6,500,000 tons, is second only to that of the United States, and represents about 20 per cent. of world tanker tonnage, while at the beginning of the year over 50 per cent. of all tonnage on order in

Continued on p. 4

PAUL ROBESON REFUSED PASSPORT FOR WALES

THE world-famous American Negro singer Paul Robeson has been refused restoration of his passport. He had accepted an invitation to attend the South Wales miners' annual Eisteddfod at Portcawl on October 3, but the American State Department has made it impossible for him legally to leave America.

The State Department asked Mr. Robeson in July, 1950, to give up his passport because it was considered that any trip he might make abroad "would not be in the interests of the United States." A spokesman of the Department said Mr. Robeson had made speeches disparaging the policy of the United States and praising Russia. A suit seeking the restoration of the passport was dismissed in 1952.

Mr. W. Paynter, South Wales Miners' president, said that the executive intended to ask their M.P.'s to try to get the decision reversed. It is difficult to see, however, just what influence British Labour M.P.'s are likely to have with the all-mighty State Department of America.

Mr. Paynter went on to say: "This action by the American State Department confirms the doubts of many people as to its conduct in relation to Negro subjects and reveals that liberty and freedom for the individual as practised in the States is far different from what they preach abroad."

This, of course, goes for all governments, but we wonder why Mr. Paynter should have stressed the colour of Robeson's skin rather than that of his politics. It is because Robeson is a fellow-traveller, to say the least, that his passport is withheld, not because he is a Negro, although that certainly adds an extra reason for the defenders of the Free World to show they have as much contempt for freedom as their opposite numbers behind the iron curtain.

FOREIGN COMMENTARY EUROPE: AN ARMED PRISON?

IF the Americans get their way—and they seem to be—Europe will be converted into a fortified camp, in which we shall be as much the prisoners on the outside of the Iron Curtain as are the unfortunate people who now live behind it. The agreement with Franco for the establishment of naval and air bases in Spain which was signed in Washington last week-end is yet another step not only in the encirclement of Russian dominated Europe but of Europe itself. Welcoming the pact, the *New York Herald Tribune* (N.Y. edition) describes how this new "link" is fitting into the rest of the chain:

"Now the whole northern shore of that vital inland sea [the Mediterranean] has been linked, in one form or another, in a defensive alliance, guarded by ships and air bases and by a substantial ground army. The structure of Mediterranean guarantees is complex: Turkey, Greece, Italy, France, Great Britain and the United States are joined in NATO; Yugoslavia has less formal ties with members of this combination and now Spain is brought in solely by agreement with America. There are sources of friction, too, within the combination, since Franco's Spanish government is far from popular with several of the NATO nations. Italy is at odds with Yugoslavia and the unresolved problem of the Arab peoples on the southern coast of the Mediterranean presents possible difficulties."

At the same time as this link was being forged, the North Atlantic Council was approving a programme for the production in Europe of more than \$1,000 million (£340 million) worth of ammunition. Every member State of N.A.T.O. (with the exception of Luxembourg) will be busy turning out every type of ammunition from small arms bullets to heavy calibre shells. Contemporaneously with this plan—"the largest so far prepared for a single category of military equipment" according to N.A.T.O. Secretary General, Lord Ismay—will be another \$1,000 million plan for the construction of aircraft and ships.

With conscription in force in all countries, the picture—or rather, the nightmare—is complete. Though not quite. If Rep. Charles Kerston has his own way all fugitives from behind the Iron Curtain should be "formed into national military units to encourage resistance to Russia"

And whilst this orgy of waste proceeds unchecked—wasted industrial effort, wasted man-power, wasted raw materials and natural resources—seven tenths of the world's population, on the United Nations own admission, have not enough to eat to keep them in "health and strength".

Trading with the "Enemy" Controversy BUSINESS IS BUSINESS

THE High Commissioner for Ceylon in Britain did not mince his words at a conference in Glasgow last week when he justified his country's flagrant disregard for Senator McCarthy's threats that America should cut off with a penny those countries that dare trade with the Iron Curtain nations.

He pointed out that whereas the United States could offer no more than the world market price for rubber, China was paying eightpence a pound more; and whereas the United States would not sell rice in return to Ceylon at less than £70 a metric ton, China was asking only £54. Rice was needed to save starving people in Ceylon, and China would provide 200,000 tons a year on these terms. Ceylon had been unable to get fair and equitable terms from the United States.

And he concluded, with the unkindest cut of all, when he attacked those Governments which are ready to give from abundant coffers "provided that we agree to their terms, and agree to be camp-followers of an ideology and a way of life." Ceylon, he said, did not want any assistance if there were conditions attached. "We refuse to be intimidated by international thuggery."

Tut! Tut! Sir Edwin. "International thuggery" is really not a very polite way of referring to what we always understood to be "democratic aid"!

On the other side of the Atlantic that spokesman for American democracy—or "thuggery" to use Sir Edwin's terminology—was calling on the government to withhold further aid from Britain until she toed the line, and stops shipping goods to China. One can imagine the Senator quite purple in the face as he declared that action should be taken immediately to warn nations supplying Red China with "economic and military strength" that they would not receive "one cent or one farthing" of American aid unless they end traffic with the enemy."

"Of course, appeasers will scream that this means we will have to go it alone," he said. "We don't want to go it alone. We want allies. But if you must fight in a dark alley you do not want as your

helper a man who sticks a knife in your back and hands weapons to your enemy.

"We hope we shall never have to do it alone. At the same time we don't want allies who cringe and surrender in face of an enemy threat or who lick the enemy's hand and furnish him with the weapons of war.

"A nation cannot be half-loyal to the free world. Those allies—alleged allies—must be for us, or against us. We can't take half-way."

There's the problem in a nut-shell: "You are either with us or against us". To our mind such a world can hardly be called a "free" one. Sir Edwin referred to it as a world of "camp-followers".

Man's Inhumanity to Man

DEATH has ended John Pipala's nineteen-year struggle to be re-united with his wife and son. It was a struggle against that part of the Machine called Immigration Laws. In 1934 Mrs. Pipala and her son left America for Poland in a voluntary effort to rectify her earlier illegal entry into the United States. Subsequently, United States consular authorities in Poland declined to approve her return to the U.S. on the ground that she had violated the immigration laws.

In the intervening years Mr. Pipala was aided by friends, lawyers and legislators but their efforts were in vain.

The long fight to bring his wife and son to America seemed near success last February when he finally obtained entry permission from the Government, but a new barrier faced him: His kin were behind the Iron Curtain and it was impossible to get them across the border.

Have you renewed your
Subscription to
FREEDOM?

RITUAL MURDER

HARD upon the controversy aroused by the Evans report has now come the Report of the Royal Commission on the Death Penalty. And at the same time two lawyer M.P.'s have published a book analysing not only the Evans case, but that of the nineteen-year-old Derek Bentley and of Walter Graham Rowland as well. Potentially, therefore the public is faced with a considerable mass of material regarding capital punishment and the reliability of the Courts as a means of assessing innocence or guilt without the possibility of mis-

It is not proposed here to deal with the main issues—they require to be considered in detail and at greater length. But it is opportune to consider the vehicle whereby much of the relevant information reaches the public at large. Few though people will read the Royal Commission's report, and Sidney Silverman and R. T. Paget's book will probably not have an enormous sale; hence the main channel of information remains the daily press.

It was recently pointed out in FREEDOM that when the Scott-Henry report claiming to establish Evans' guilt was published, the press showed a sign of smug relief. But when M.P.'s attacked the report and its less satisfactory aspects were exposed, it became sensational news again. One can only feel that if an acquaintance were to exhibit similar reactions to that of the "responsible" press one would regard him as a person of very unstable opinions indeed, whose advice on any important matter would not be worth seeking.

Interesting, too, is the attitude shown by the educated intelligentsia in the press. Lord Hailsham, for example, wrote in the *Evening Standard* a week or so back defending the Evans Report in a highly dogmatic manner. He now denounces the Silverman-Paget book on Evans-Bentley-Rowland in the same journal as "a libel on British justice" of which the authors "ought to be thoroughly ashamed".

"Pendennis", a pseudonymous columnist in the *Observer* wrote of Silverman and Paget in a most unpleasantly sneering and hostile way which reduced his usually staid column to the level of a gossip writer's in the gutter press. This reaction surely stems from the sense of injury and insecurity that is aroused whenever it is suggested that in a matter which we are all responsible for, like the death penalties, we may be condoning gross miscarriages of justice. (That is the surface of the matter: there is also the less respectable question of the unconscious psychological pleasures and satisfactions involved in execution—for it is not only the crowd outside the prison gates on execution mornings who get vicarious satisfaction from this barbarous ritual).

Unfortunately abuse of those who criticize is a poor rebuttal of their charges. Lord Hailsham's attack is full of accusations that Silverman and Paget have "ignored" inconvenient evidence. But when he comes to describe the case of Rowland, he upholds the Appeal Court and the special enquiry which rejected the evidence of the man Ware who came forward and confessed that he had done the murder for which Rowland was found guilty. But Lord Hailsham does not so much as mention that four years later Ware was found guilty of attempted murder of a woman by exactly the same method—repeated blows on the head with a hammer—that Rowland is said to have used. And it is surprising how many public people are willing to accept the coincidence of two stranglers at Rillington Place.

In short the press has shown its

Soviet Admissions in Agriculture

SEVERAL weeks ago FREEDOM commented upon a change in Soviet agricultural policy which bore some resemblance to the New Economic Policy (N.E.P.) of 1923. After many years of intensive pressure to proletarianize more and more of the Russian peasants by forcing them into collective farms, the new line gives some respite and is encouraging peasants to grow food and raise stock on their own small-holdings. Of course concessions have been made to the peasants before when the harshness and unpopularity of the collective methods in agriculture had raised so much opposition or produced so much economic chaos that the central control of the government was threatened. But the present changes are more far reaching than any since the N.E.P. ended in 1928 with the introduction of the First Five Year Plan. They are also more far reaching and more widely applied, since similar changes of policy are reported in the satellite countries, and hints that something similar is happening in China.

Since further theoretical interest attaches to these changes also in the fact that the crisis in Russian agriculture is not nearly so severe as it was, for example in 1932 and 1933, when despite widespread famines carrying an enormous death toll, the government ruthlessly continued the collectivization of agriculture with only minor concessions to the peasants. The present changes therefore suggest that there has been a change in the theoretical approach to agriculture. It has been widely suggested that such changes are connected with Stalin's death and represent a revision of Soviet theoretical concepts. However, it seems wiser to take a more cautious view, partly because N.E.P.-like concessions have from time to time been made in the past; and also because the changes may not in fact represent so serious a revision of Marxism applied to agriculture as may at first sight appear.

Deficiencies in Collective Farms

At all events, the change is based on certain declared deficiencies in agricultural production under the collective farm system—a system which is linked with the policy of forcing industrialization as rapidly as possible upon the economically backward communities of Eastern Europe and Russia itself. The Czech Prime Minister Siroky two weeks ago admitted a fall in food production, and promised to cut government investment in heavy industry by 16.5 per cent. while investing an extra £73,000,000 in agriculture. A similar concession had already been announced in Hungary where it was even suggested that the principle of collectivized farms was wrong.

The Rumanian Prime Minister, Gheorghiu-Dej, on September 14, declared that "All deliveries from peasants due to the State for 1952 were being

usual irresponsibility and sensationalism, despite the gravity of the question at issue.

As a contrast, an Italian journal is campaigning for world wide abolition of capital punishment (Italy has no death penalty), and declares that such a step would be a first move towards world peace. It demands not merely the abolition of execution for crimes such as murder, but also of the death penalty for political "offences".

If one looks at the world one sees that far more people are killed by the State for political reasons than for crime, and though this is commonplace behind the Iron Curtain it is also widespread in the "free" world. It has become regular reading to see reports that 10, 20, or 30-odd alleged Mau-Mau leaders have been condemned to death in Kenya. In Malaya a girl of 22 was condemned to death last week for carrying a rifle, and it makes little difference to the essential barbarity to label her a terrorist.

Nor has public opinion been stirred overmuch by the fact that the former Prime Minister of Persia, Mossadeq, now lies under the threat of hanging. In the political world more and more the tendency is to treat opposition by liquidation.

FREEDOM once again reiterates its view that the death penalty is a barbarous, brutal ritual, maintained by ugly but concealed psychological satisfactions; and that it ought to be abolished whatever "practical" considerations are involved, as simply unethical and wrong.

cancelled. There would also be a reduction of taxation for small-holders as well as for collective farms. Peasants with large families would be exempt from taxation, as well as farms belonging to old and infirm persons or those having sons in the Army. Considerable tax reductions, and in some cases, exemption, have been announced for livestock breeders, silk-worm breeders, growers of industrial crops, newly planted orchards and vineyards." (*Times* 15.9.53).

He admitted that "75 per cent. of the marketable grain in Rumania still came from private cultivators, and said that this category of peasants must receive due consideration. He also admitted that so far only about 300,000 peasant families had joined the collective farms, which to-day numbered about 2,000" (*ibid.*).

Russian Figures

The most detailed and interesting figures come from Russia, however. In his report to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Khrushchev, gives figures for Russian production of livestock over the whole period of Leninist rule, and these figures are very illuminating. They show that Russian agricultural output has been never substantially higher than in Tsarist times, although according to government claims, the population is much greater. Khrushchev gave the following figures for stock populations (in millions):—

	1916	1928	1941	1945
Beef & dairy cattle	55.4	66.8	54.5	56.6
Cows (included in above)	28.8	33.2	27.8	24.3
Pigs	23.0	27.7	27.5	28.5
Sheep & goats	96.3	114.6	91.6	109.9
Horses	38.2	36.1	21.0	15.3

Khrushchev said that in recent years livestock have been increasing very slowly and the number of cows in Russia has still not reached pre-war level.

The dates chosen above are interesting. 1916 is the last pre-revolutionary year, when Tsarist economy was at its most chaotic, and output was at the lowest level. 1928 is the last year of the N.E.P. and no figures are advanced for the catastrophic fall in stock population caused by the First Five Year Plan, recovery from which followed slowly upon concessions to the peasants and relaxation of the collectivization pressure. 1941 is the year of Russia's entry into the war against Germany, and 1945 is the last war year.*

These figures therefore tend to conceal the disasters of Marxist agriculture although in doing so they also fail to show the recovery which did take place. Soviet statistics are always suspect and

*Alexander Werth points out in a letter to the *Manchester Guardian* (29/9/53) that 1945 in the last column is a misprint on *Reuters*' part for 1953 and he has checked this by looking up the Soviet press reports of Khrushchev's report. This only makes the figures more revealing still and Khrushchev's target of 65 million cattle by the end of next year even more ambitious.

statistics everywhere are always used to back particular arguments. Nevertheless Khrushchev's figures agree substantially with those given before the war, for example, by Doreen Warriner (*Economics of Peasant Farming*—figures in millions)

	1916	1929	1932	1933	1935	1936
Cattle	60.6	68.1	40.7	38.4	49.2	57.7
Pigs	30.9	30.9	11.6	12.1	22.5	30.4
Sheep	121.2	147.2	52.1	50.2	61.1	73.7
Horses	35.8	34.0	19.6	16.6	15.9	16.6

The upshot is that Khrushchev has in effect admitted that Soviet methods in agriculture have left production at about the same position as it was during the last and worst year of Tsarism. From other figures and from historical accounts we know that when Marxist policy towards the peasants was applied with full rigour as in the period of "War Communism", or the Five Year Plan, production fell to disastrous levels.

Peasant and Proletariat

Marxism is characterized by a hostile attitude towards the peasant. Marx regarded the proletariat, that is the wage working masses thrown up by the industrial revolution in the "advanced" or capitalist countries as the only bearers of revolutionary potential. His attitude is revealed in that appallingly revealing, because half-admiring, remark in the *Communist Manifesto* (1847): "The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a consider-

able part of the population from the idiocy of rural life."

Even now, and despite his admissions, Khrushchev shows no going back on the Marxist outlook towards the peasants for he declared that "The Socialist agriculture of the U.S.S.R. which has been developed and firmly established under the leadership of the Communist Party, rests on a powerful industrial base and is the biggest and most mechanized agricultural system in the world."

Concessions from this position have always been towards allowing more freedom of initiative to the peasant, and have always resulted in increased production, despite the fact that the incentive has always been profit. (Khrushchev uses the Soviet euphemism, and elegantly refers to the "people's material interest" as an incentive to increased output!)

The Political Issue

However, it is a mistake to see either Marx's attitude or that of his modern Russian followers as though it were simply an issue of economic output. The peasants have been always the most powerful threat to Communist rule, and both war communism and the collectivization of agriculture were really directed towards controlling the peasants by turning them into wage slaves. This was done without immediate regard for the food supply and resulted in ghastly famines in 1921 and 1932-33. Such disregard for economic results can only be due to political gains by the government in its perpetual war against the peasants. Concessions may be made when the economic situation is disastrously deteriorating, but political considerations must always dictate that the government seek to weaken the peasantry once again.

How Not to Run Industry

NOT long ago I was talking to a friend who is a fairly junior director of a very large business. I asked him about his problems in the post-war world.

"There's nothing wrong with the post-war world from the point of view of our business," he said wearily. "All that's wrong is that of the three men who really control this outfit, each one would rather see it go bankrupt than let either of the other two do something good and get the credit for it."

Now here the damage done by the mutual jealousies of these three men is largely "indirect". They may, and probably do, make one another unhappy.

But what is far more important, they damage the several thousand other people who work in the business that they control. In order to frustrate one another, they must frustrate everybody else in the organisation.

At the other end of the business hierarchy, I remember an occasion when I had been asked to advise on a certain factory problem. (I was not a member

of the staff, and was therefore in a more or less independent position).

One day a man working at the bench quietly suggested to me a solution of the problem.

It was one of those ideas which are very simple when you have thought of them. But the fact remains that neither the management nor I had thought of this one. Not wishing for once to take credit for an idea that was not mine, I suggested to the workman that he should put his idea to the management. I would support it.

He shook his head with a knowing smile, and said, "Not me. I know that game."

I said "But why not?" "Because the foreman wouldn't like it. There's been two chaps who've had good ideas here in the last year, and he's worked them both out within a month. Don't you ever let on that I gave you that idea, or I'll be looking for another job."

—Nigel Balchin on Jealousy.
—*Sunday Express* 23/8/53.

The Shape of Our Surroundings

Continued from p. 2

tion of his ideas on a scale greater than that of the individual building "they could offer no remedy on a large scale for the irrevocable disintegration of our cities. They are cut loose from the forces out of which a new social conscience and a new *élan vital* can grow. Open spaces must be regained by a dispersal of population and industry over wide areas but not by a perpetuation of an even greater concentration within a narrow space."

THIS attack on the city does not imply a defence of life and work in the country as we know it to-day. "About one half of the world's population are peasants or farmers. Their standard of living varies greatly all over the globe but they have in common an attitude that is antagonistic to the cities and a desire to take part in the advantages of a technical civilization." People with romantic ideas about country life have "helped to spread the myth of the peasant as the true pillar of the State, as the prototype of the citizen who loves the State and is deeply attached to it. In reality the peasant loves his pieces of land and hates the State which is for him, the great interloper. He is for the *status quo* and against any change if it is not in his immediate interest." The factors which keep people on the land are emotional attachment to a known environment, protection from complete unemployment and the ability to provide at least the bare minimum of existence, (with the qualification that innumerable landless labourers are in this respect as insecure as the urban unemployed), and finally, the restricted absorptive capacity

of industry. Re-migration from the cities to the country is extremely rare, and in any case rural over-population is the crucial problem in the whole of South-East Asia and many other parts of the world.

How can the disinclination to live and work in the country be explained? Gutkind believes that the main reason "lies in the discrepancy between rural and urban ways of reacting intellectually and emotionally to the challenge which the interaction of man and environment raises ever anew and to which a response must be found. Once man has passed over the threshold where life becomes abstract and speculative, where certain amenities are within easy reach, where working hours keep within definite limits, and where men feel, though this is a mere illusion, that they are not outsiders, once this has happened, he must be an unusual being who would go back to the country."

The world's peasants are on the move. The war and the post-war period "have shown them in ruthless clarity their paramount importance to the survival of mankind. But the soil, the workshop of the peasant, is also on the move. Erosion is spreading at a pace and on a scale which cannot be balanced by bringing more land under the plough." The fear of famine might induce mankind to take the various measures to increase food production and fertility, "but it is difficult to believe that mankind as a whole will be sensible enough to develop all these possibilities to full capacity at the same time in all parts of the world. It is much more likely that the peasant will become something like a pampered child and be told how indispensable he is; how gladly one would do this or that for

him if only he would produce more food; if the financial resources only would allow more money to be spent on public utility services in rural areas; and if this . . . and that . . . or . . . etc., Land reform will be almost fashionable, and birth control will be the theme at hen parties. But what sort of Land reform? Land reform as an emotional outlet or Land reform as a rational proposition? Breaking up of large estates as a political moratorium on the life-time of unimaginative governments, or maintaining large estates and even creating new ones as the mainstay of a mechanised agriculture? And birth control—how to introduce it among the peasantry of China, India and Indonesia, that is the real issue."

Gutkind goes on to discuss food production and human production the theme for so many current cries of alarm and to demonstrate that the external remedies which treat this problem in a vacuum are mere charlatanry, summing up his argument in these terms:

- (1) a revolution of environment is unavoidable.
- (2) an integration of rural and urban life on a higher level is essential;
- (3) a new pattern of living will bring about a new phase of enlightenment;
- (4) given the realization of these aims a higher standard of living will be the result;
- (5) in consequence of a higher standard of living birth rates will fall and food production will go up;
- (6) birth rates will be more dependent on deliberate decisions than on spontaneous or fatalistic urges;
- (7) no task is more pressing than a peaceful revolution of environment;
- (8) and this is the only way to reduce external frictions, thus freeing mankind from the fear of wars and famines.

(To be concluded)

